REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 1, 2007, claims 5-7, 12-13, 17-18, 22-23, 33-53 are pending in the application. Claims 50-53 are allowed. Claims 5-7, 12-13, 17, 18, 22-23, 33-34, and 36-49 stand rejected. Claims 5-7, 12-13, 17, 22-23, 33-34, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,310,610 ("Beaton"). Claims 18 and 37-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,274 ("Watanabe"). Claim 35 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant amends claims 23, 33, 37, 43, 47, and 50-52 and adds new claims 54-57. Applicant also cancels claims 6-7, 12-13, and 41-42 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 50-53 and the indication that claim 35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant amends claims 50 to improve consistency in the use of term touch-sensitive display. Applicant amends claims 51 and 52 to correct their dependency such that they now depend from claim 50. Claim 35 is rewritten in independent form as new claim 56. No new matter is added.

Amended independent claims 33 and 37 and new independent claim 54 each recite a velocity detector for determining a velocity vector based on a velocity of motion of a pointer across a touch sensitive screen, as detected by a display monitor. Each of these claims also recites a user interface command that is executed by the engine recited in the claims based on the determined velocity. Neither Beaton nor Watanabe, alone, or in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests this subject matter.

In the rejection of now canceled claim 6, the Action asserts that Beaton discloses a velocity detector at column 6, lines 5-18. This passage reads as follows:

> The user may control the speed of the navigation. As shown in FIG. 11A, the speed of navigation accelerates as the user touch moves from the center of the circle toward the circumference of the circle, i.e., tip of the arrow. Hence the viewing window moves slowly when the user touches the blunt end of the arrow located at the center of the circle while the speed accelerates as the user moves the finger towards the tip of the arrow. The speed of navigation, therefore, is determined by the distance of the touch relative to the center of the circle.

11

While this passage may state that speed of navigation accelerates as a user touch moves from the center of a circle to its circumference, the passage fails to describe, teach, or suggest, the speed accelerating based on the rate at which the user touch moves form the center to the circumference, i.e., the velocity of touch movement. To the contrary, the passage specifically indicates that the speed is based the distance of the touch relative to the center of the circle. Beaton fails to disclose a detector for detecting the velocity with which the user moves a touch across a touch sensitive screen or the use of such a detected velocity to effectuate a user interface command. This, however, is the explicit subject matter of amended independent 33 and 37 and new independent claim 54.

Watanabe fails to bridge the gap Beaton and independent claims 33, 37, and 54. Watanabe describes a digital map display zooming method for continuously enlarging and reducing a displayed portion of a digital map. Abstract. Watanabe fails to disclose a touch screen display, or any particular way of interacting with a touch screen display. Thus, Watanabe fails to cure the deficiencies of Beaton.

Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claim 33 and the § 103 rejection of amended independent claim 37. Claims 5, 17, 18, 22, 23, and 34-36 depend form claim 33 and add further limitations thereto. Claims 38-40, and 43-49 depend on claim 37, and add further limitations thereto. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 and § 103 rejections of these claims, too. Based on these remarks, Applicant also requests allowance of new independent claim 54 and new claim 55, which depends on claim 54 and adds further limitations thereto.

Finally, Applicant adds new independent claim 57. Independent claim 57 is similar to now canceled claim 34 rewritten independent form, as presented in Applicant's prior response. In particular, new claim 57 recites the detection of a page flip command in response to the recited display monitor detecting a brushing motion across the document rendered on the touch-sensitive display by the engine. Independent claim 57 further recites that in response to the page flip command, the engine renders a second page of the document on the touch-sensitive display.

Claim 34 was rejected under § 102 over Beaton. Beaton however fails to describe, teach, or suggest rendering a second page of a document in response to detecting a brushing motion across

12

that document, as specifically recited in the claims. The Action asserts this subject matter is disclosed at column 5, lines 34-41. Applicant disagrees.

First, the Action asserts that a user "touching" different arrows to navigate pages constitutes the detection of a brushing motion across a document. Action at page 12. As the Action correctly indicates, the cited passage merely refers to detecting a touch of an arrow. It fails to disclose detecting a brush across the arrow or any other image or document. Detecting a brushing motion, however, is the explicit subject matter of new claim 57.

In addition, a touch of the arrow, in Beaton, does not result in a the rendering of a "second page" of the document across which the brush was detected, as recited in the claim. Instead, It results in navigation of a different document. In contrast, new independent claim 57 specifically recites that the brush across the document results in the rending of a second page of the document, i.e., the document across which the brush was detected. For at least the above reasons, Applicant requests allowance of new independent claim 57.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response other than as reflected on the enclosed Amendment Transmittal. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. PGLD-P01-003 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Edward A. Gordon
   Registration No.: 54,130
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

13

10730454_1.DOC